

James B. Wright Senior Attorney

Wake Forest, NC 27587-5900 Mailstop NCWKFR0313 Voice 919 554 7587 Fax 919 554 7913 james.b.wright@mail.sprint.com

14111 Capital Boulevard

\*02 806 30 PM 12 40

August 29, 2002 ORY AUTHORISY

The Honorable Chairman Sara Kyle Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243

RE: Docket No. 00-00702 (Rulemaking Proceeding – Regulations for Term Arrangements for Telecommunications Services)
Sprint's Comments

Dear Chairman Kyle:

Pursuant to the August 20, 2002 Notice issued in this case, enclosed for filing are the original and thirteen copies of the Comments of United Telephone-Southeast, Inc. and Sprint Communications Company L.P.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely yours,

James B. Wright

Enclosure

CC: Laura Sykora Kaye Odum RECEIVED

AUG 3 0 2002

SARA KYLE, COMMISSIONER TN PUBLIC SERVICE COMM.

## BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:	)	
	)	
RULEMAKING PROCEEDING-	)	
REGULATIONS FOR TERM	)	<b>DOCKET NO. 00-00702</b>
ARRANGEMENTS FOR	· )	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	)	
SERVICES	· )	

## UNITED TELEPHONE – SOUTHEAST, INC., AND SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P. <u>SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING CSAs AND PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE</u>

The Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") issued a Notice of Filing and Pre-Hearing Conference on August 20, 2002 requesting suggested criteria for reviewing contract service arrangements (CSAs or special contracts) and a proposed procedural schedule in the Rulemaking Proceeding-Regulations for Term Arrangements for Telecommunications Services (Docket No. 00-00702). The above named companies (hereinafter "Sprint") file these comments in response to the TRA's Notice.

Suggested Criteria for Reviewing CSAs

Sprint respectfully submits the following criteria for reviewing CSAs.

1) Competitive Local Exchange Carriers' (CLECs) special contracts should be exempt from the rules and regulations governing special contracts, as should all Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers' (ILECs) special contracts negotiated in competitive proposal or competitive bid situations. In T.C.A. §65-4-123 the Tennessee General Assembly stated its policy supporting a competitive telecommunications environment. In

addition, T.C.A. §65-5-208(b) indicates that: "The authority, after notice and opportunity for hearing, may find that the public interest and the policies set forth herein are served by exempting a service or group of services from all or a portion of the requirements of this part . . ." However, "The authority shall in any event exempt a telecommunication service for which existing and potential competition is an effective regulator of the price of those services." All CLEC contracts are by their nature negotiated in competitive situations and, therefore, should be exempt from specific regulations regarding special contracts. In keeping with the above position, any ILEC special contract executed as a result of a competitive proposal or competitive bid situation should also be exempt from regulation in accordance with the above Tennessee statute.

- 2) Special contracts should be filed when customer-requested services are not available under the general tariffs or when differences in circumstances and conditions justify different rates. If, consistent with T.C.A. §65-5-208(b), competitive contracts are exempted from regulation, Sprint supports the criterion that special contracts should be filed for TRA approval when the customer requests a service not currently tariffed or when differences in circumstances and conditions justify different rates.
- 3) The identity of the parties to a special contract should be disclosed unless the interests of any company would thereby be injuriously affected. While Sprint supports the disclosure of the identity of the parties to a CSA consistent with the Public Records Act derived from T.C.A. §65-3-109, Sprint also submits that language in this statute specifically allows the filing of such agreements as proprietary and allows the TRA to handle special contracts confidentially if disclosure would injure the companies involved.

4) Special contracts should be made available to any similarly situated customer satisfying the required terms and conditions of the special agreement upon request.

Sprint's ILEC General Subscriber Services Tariff (Section U5) lists the service and price(s) charged in conjunction with special contract arrangements. Such tariffs are publicly available and should be sufficient for similarly situated customers to inquire about these services. The TRA's complaint resolution mechanism is sufficient to ensure that contract service arrangements are made available to any similarly situated customer.

5) Termination liabilities should be limited to the recovery of discounts and customer-specific investment. Since the matter of termination liabilities is pertinent not only to special contracts but also to term discount plans (TDPs) currently tariffed, the recovery of any customer-specific investment should be allowed for early termination of a special contract and discounts off month-to-month rates given the customer in conjunction with a tariffed term discount plan should also be recoverable. Sprint asserts that failure to recover the TDP discounts for early termination would be discriminatory against customers who choose not to enter into a term discount plan (i.e. month-to-month customers).

## Proposed Procedural Schedule

Sprint proposes the following procedural schedule for the handling of this docket:

Tuesday, September 12, 2002 Discovery Issued

Tuesday, September 19, 2002 Discovery Responses

Tuesday, September 25, 2002 Testimony

Tuesday, October 1-October 4, 2002 Hearing

The above dates are in addition to the Pre-hearing Conference already scheduled for September 9, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED TELEPHONE-SOUTHEAST, INC. SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.

James B. Wright
Senior Attorney

August 29, 2002